

## **REMARKS**

Claims 9-21 stand rejected on the basis of Sakamoto et al., alone or in combination with other references. Independent claim 9 has been amended to overcome this rejection by reciting wrinkle-like unevenness having a plurality of protrusions. Other amendments to claim 9 are cosmetic in nature, and are unrelated to patentability.

Applicants traverse this rejection because Sakamoto et al. do not disclose or suggest a wrinkle-like unevenness having a plurality of protrusions and multiple linear parts extending from the top ends of connecting parts, as in amended claim 9.

Amended claim 9 recites, among other things, a wrinkle-free unevenness having a plurality of protrusions. Support for the claimed protrusions is found in Figs. 18, 19A-19G, 20A, 20B, 21A and 21B. Amended claim 9 also provides that the wrinkle-free unevenness has at least three linear parts. The second linear part extends from the top end of the first linear part, and the third linear part extends from the top end of the second linear part.

According to amended claim 9, the wrinkle-like unevenness has a plurality of protrusions. If these protrusions are arranged in parallel with each other, the wrinkle can be formed continuously and periodically on the surface of the unevenness.

As a practical matter, the mesh-like configuration disclosed in Sakamoto cannot have the same wrinkle features. In the case of Sakamoto, the wrinkle can only be formed partially inside areas divided by the projections 94 in the mesh-like configuration.

Because of the fine mesh-like configuration of Sakamoto, each of the areas divided by the projections 94 is too small. Therefore, it would be difficult to form the wrinkle inside each area. This is because a somewhat large area is necessary for forming the wrinkle.

Moreover, Sakamoto et al. describe projections 94 which “exhibit an irregularly patterned mesh-like structure” [¶ 48]. The mesh-like structure of the projections 94 is shown, for example, in Fig. 4A. The mesh-like structure has at most one projection extending from the top end of one other projection, but this does not suggest the present invention, because the figure taken as a whole shows an unordered mesh-like structure, as described in the written description of the reference.

In contrast, the wrinkle-free unevenness of the present invention creates an ordered pattern, as seen in Fig. 18 of the present specification, for example. This ordered pattern is achieved in part by extending the linear portions from the ends of other linear portions, where two portions connect. Thus, this feature of the present invention is not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9 and its related dependent claims 10-21, is respectfully requested.

New claim 32 recites, among other things, that “said plurality of the protrusions are arranged in parallel with each other when viewed from a direction perpendicular to the reflecting plate; and each of the protrusions has a first linear part extending in a first direction, a second linear part extending from the top end of the first linear part in a second direction different from the first direction by certain angles to a predetermined side, and a

third linear part extending from the top end of the second linear part in a third direction different from the second direction by certain angles to the predetermined side.” This feature is based on the original Figs. 18, 19A-19G, 20A, 20B, 21A and 21B.

The projections 94 of Sakamoto are in a mesh-like configuration, and are not in parallel with each other. Therefore, Sakamoto does not teach/disclose this feature of claim 32.

New claim 33 recites, among other things, that “the second direction in which the second linear part extends is a vertical direction of a display surface of the liquid crystal display device or a horizontal direction of the display surface of the liquid crystal display device.” This feature is based on the original Figs. 18, 19A-19G, 20A, 20B, 21A and 21B.

According to Sakamoto, Figs. 4A, 4B, 5A, 5B and 11A, the projections 94 are arranged obliquely with respect to the vertical direction of the display surface of the liquid crystal display device and with respect to the horizontal direction of the display surface of the liquid crystal display device. That is, the projections 94 of Sakamoto do not extend in the vertical direction of the display surface of the liquid crystal display device or in the horizontal direction of the display surface of the liquid crystal display device. Therefore, Sakamoto does not teach/disclose this feature of claim 33.

New claim 34 recites, among other things, that “said plurality of the protrusions are arranged so as not to cross each other.” According to this feature, the protrusions are arranged so as not to cross each other and so as to be at least generally in parallel with each

other. Therefore, the wrinkle can be formed continuously and periodically on the surface of the unevenness.

In the case of Sakamoto, because of the fine mesh-like configuration, each of the areas divided by the projections 94 is too small. Therefore, it is difficult to form the wrinkle inside each area. On this account, the wrinkle cannot be formed continuously and periodically on the surface of the unevenness of Sakamoto. For these reasons, applicants submit that claims 32-34 are allowable over Sakamoto.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

March 13, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978  
P:\DOCS\4319\70099\9W1672.DOC